



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/690,150	10/21/2003	Jordan R. Silverstein	5853-312	3918

30448 7590 01/11/2005

AKERMAN SENTERFITT
P.O. BOX 3188
WEST PALM BEACH, FL 33402-3188

EXAMINER

HOGAN, JAMES SEAN

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

3752

DATE MAILED: 01/11/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	10/690,150	SILVERSTEIN ET AL.	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	James S Hogan	3752	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 21 October 2003.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-25 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☒ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-8, 10-15 and 18-25 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) 9-10 and 16-17 is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☒ The drawing(s) filed on 21 October 2003 is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☒ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|---|---|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413) |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152) |
| Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____ | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ |

DETAILED ACTION

Drawings

1. The drawings are objected to under 37 CFR 1.83(a) because they fail to show how the invention is fitted to a sprinkler head as described in the specification. Also not noted is a reference number pointing out the "glass bulb" of the sprinkler shown in Figure 1. Any structural detail that is essential for a proper understanding of the disclosed invention should be shown in the drawing. MPEP § 608.02(d). Corrected drawing sheets in compliance with 37 CFR 1.121(d) are required in reply to the Office action to avoid abandonment of the application. Any amended replacement drawing sheet should include all of the figures appearing on the immediate prior version of the sheet, even if only one figure is being amended. The figure or figure number of an amended drawing should not be labeled as "amended." If a drawing figure is to be canceled, the appropriate figure must be removed from the replacement sheet, and where necessary, the remaining figures must be renumbered and appropriate changes made to the brief description of the several views of the drawings for consistency. Additional replacement sheets may be necessary to show the renumbering of the remaining figures. The replacement sheet(s) should be labeled "Replacement Sheet" in the page header (as per 37 CFR 1.84(c)) so as not to obstruct any portion of the drawing figures. If the changes are not accepted by the examiner, the applicant will be notified and informed of any required corrective action in the next Office action. The objection to the drawings will not be held in abeyance.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

2. Claims 21-25 rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, as failing to comply with the enablement requirement. The claim(s) contains subject matter which was not described in the specification in such a way as to enable one skilled in the art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to make and/or use the invention. Mainly, the specification fails to provide methodology as to how a compressed air source for inflating a bladder to "at least equal to the water pressure found in the fire sprinkler system". Such language does not account for systems that provide specific high pressures, nor does it include a range of pressures normally found.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

3. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

4. Claims 1-4, 9, 11-15, and 18-20 rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 4,423,820 to Katz.

5. Referring to claims 1-2, and 4, Katz discloses a device having a bladder (36) with a valve (68) that can be coupled to a fluid supply. A clamp (17) couples the bladder to the valve. As for claims 5 and 13, an alternate embodiment of the Katz ('829) device, Figures 8-11, shows a version with an outer bladder (36) having an inner bladder (88). Additionally, the inner bladder (88) is constructed of materials impermeable to fluids

Art Unit: 3752

(polypropylene) as per claim 12. Katz does not teach utilizing the device for fitting between a support structure of a fire sprinkler and sealing the exhaust port. Fire sprinklers are well known in the prior art. Using the device of Katz ('829) However, it would have been obvious to one skilled in the art at the time the invention was made to have employed the device of Katz ('829) to seal the exhaust port of an actuated fire sprinkler during a fire emergency to plug the sprinkler and combat the fire by standard fire-extinguishing means.

6. Referring to claims 6, 12, and further 7-8, and 14-15, Katz ('829) teaches that polypropylene, a substance impermeable to fluids, or "any other suitable material" (Col 11. line 21) can be used for the materials to produce bladders. It would have been obvious to one skilled in the art at the time the invention was made to have included latex as a suitable material for the construction of a bladder.

7. Referring to claims 3 and 18, it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have employed a presta valve as a preferred valve on the invention, since use of such means in lieu of those used in the reference solves no stated problem and would be an obvious matter of design choice within the skill in the art. *In Re Kuhle*, 188 USPQ 7 (CCPA 1975)

8. Referring to claims 11 and 20, official notice is taken to the claim that an invention's outer bladder be given a wear resistant coating. It would have been obvious to one skilled in the art at the time the invention was made to have considered the hostile environment of a burning structure and to have coated the outside cover of a fire discharge control device with a wear resistant coating.

Allowable Subject Matter

9. Claims 3, 9-10 and 16-18 objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.

Conclusion

10. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure is as follows:

U.S. Patent No. 4,222,499 to Lee et al disclosing a pressurized fluid dispensing apparatus

U.S. Patent No. 4,419,096 to Leeper et al. disclosing an elastomeric bladder assembly

U.S. Patent No. 4,735,239 to Salmon, disclosing a liquid projecting device

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to James S Hogan whose telephone number is (571) 272-4902. The examiner can normally be reached on Mon-Fri, 7:00a-4:00p EST.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, David Scherbel can be reached on (571) 272-4919. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Art Unit: 3752

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

JSH
1/6/2005

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read 'Dinh Q. Nguyen', with a stylized, cursive script.

DINH Q. NGUYEN
PRIMARY EXAMINER